

III. Claim Objections

Claims 1-11 were objected to because the claims contained non-elected subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 so that claims 1-11 no longer recite non-elected subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1-11 on this basis be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 2-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the meaning of the phrase “G3 as defined above” recited in claim 2 was unclear. Claims 3-11 depend from claim 2.

Applicant has amended claim 2 to clarify that the definition of G3 is the same as that recited in claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2-11 are no longer indefinite, and respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 2-11 on this basis be withdrawn.

V. Double Patenting Objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.75

Claims 4-11 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as substantial duplicates of claim 3. Applicant has amended claims 4-11 so that they now recite method claims, while claim 3 is a product claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-11 are no longer substantial duplicates of claim 3, and respectfully requests that the objections to claims 4-11 on this basis be withdrawn.

